

Application Serial No. 10/583,881
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2010

PATENT
Docket: CU-4891

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 18, 2010, claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-13 are pending and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicant asserts that the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome by amendment and/or are traversed by argument below.

In the Claims, please cancel claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, and 12-13. Claims 7 and 11 have been amended herein to be in independent form. Support for these amendments can be found in the original claims as well as the original disclosure in the description at line 29 on page 14 to line 2 on page 15. The amendments to the claims can be viewed in the Amendments section in the Listing of claims beginning on page 3 of this paper. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 06-142638 ("JP'638"), in view of U.S. 6,470,898 (Kamo).

Claims 1, 2, 6, and 12 have been cancelled herein therefore rendering the rejection of these claims moot. The Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 3, 5, 7-9, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 06-142638 ("JP'638"), in view of U.S. 6,470,898 (Kamo) and Smook (Handbook for Pulp and Paper Technologists).

Claims 3, 5, 8, 9, and 13 have been cancelled herein, and therefore, the rejection as to those claims is rendered moot.

Regarding claims 7 and 11 the Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the claims are non-obvious and allowable.

Neither JP'638 or Kamo disclose or suggest the feature "the step of dewatering the paper piece comprises squeezing and dewatering of the water-washed paper piece"

Application Serial No. 10/583,881
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2010

PATENT
Docket: CU-4891

as recited in amended claim 7 or a feature of "the dewatering device is a device configured to squeeze and dewater the water-washed paper piece". This is recognized by the Examiner in the Office Action on page 9, lines 18-19.

Furthermore, "sheet" as disclosed on line 10 and 13 in the right column on page 228 of Smook does not correspond to the feature "the water-washed paper piece" as recited in amended claims 7 and 11.

Accordingly, a disclosure of "the sheet is conveyed through a series of roll presses where additional water is removed and the web structure is consolidated (i.e. the fibers are forced into intimate contact)" at lines 13-16 in the right column on page 228 of Smook does not disclose or suggest the feature "squeezing and dewatering of the water-washed paper piece" as recited in amended claim 7 or the feature "a device configured to squeeze and dewater the water-washed paper piece" as recited in amended claim 11.

Therefore, Smook does not disclose the feature of "the step of dewatering the paper piece comprises squeezing and dewatering of the water-washed paper piece" as recited in amended claim 7 or the feature "the dewatering device is a device configured to squeeze and dewater the water-washed paper piece" as recited in amended claim 11.

Moreover, none of the "paper pieces" as disclosed, for example in paragraph [0008] of JP'638, and "paper stock" as disclosed in claim 1 of Kamo corresponds to "sheet" as disclosed at lines 10 and 13 in the right column on page 228 of Smoot.

The Applicant submits, therefore, that there is no motivation for a person of skill in the art to apply "paper pieces" as disclosed in JP'638 and "paper stock" as disclosed in Kamo to "paper machine" as disclosed in, for instance page 228 of Smook.

None of the references disclose or suggest at least the feature "the step of

Application Serial No. 10/583,881
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2010

PATENT
Docket: CU-4891

dewatering the upper piece comprises squeezing and dewatering of the water-washed paper piece" as recited in amended claim 7 or the feature "the dewatering device is a device configured to squeeze and dewater the water-washed paper piece" as recited in amended claim 11. The Applicant submits that the claims, 7 and 11, are non-obvious and allowable.

CONCLUSIONS

The Applicant respectfully contends that all conditions of patentability are met in the pending claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that this application should be in condition for allowance. Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,



Zareefa B. Flener, Pat. Reg. No. 52,896

Ladas & Parry, LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Suite 1600
Chicago, IL 60604
312/427-1300
312/427-6668 (fax)